



Planning Commission - Parks Board - Transportation Commission

Joint Meeting

July 17, 2013 at O.O. Denny Park

In attendance:

Kirkland Planning Commission (PC) Members: C.Ray Allshouse, Jay Arnold, Colleen Cullen, Glenn Peterson, Mike Miller, Jon Pascal

Kirkland Park Board (PB) Members: Sue Contreras, Rick Ockerman, Jim Popolow, Adam White, Susan Keller

Kirkland Transportation Commission (TC) Members: Joel Pfundt, Sandeep Singhal, Tom Neir, Michael Snow, John Perlic, Carl Wilson, Tom Neir

City staff: Jennifer Schroder, Eric Shields, Michael Cogle, Paul Stewart, David Godfrey, Teresa Swan, Janice Coogan

Meeting Format: The agenda for the evening included a social interactive time with refreshments and light snacks. A brief introduction and status of each of the long range plans was made followed by a discussion about the Cross Kirkland Corridor and comments about what members wanted the CKC Master Plan to include or study. The participants then separated into small groups to discuss common interests or key issues they would like to be addressed with the Comprehensive Plan update, the Parks and Recreation and Open Space Plan and Transportation Master Plan.

The following summarizes topic questions and comments generated in group discussions. Initials after each comment indicate which Board or Commission the member was from.

Cross-Kirkland Corridor (CKC)

- Start a paved portion at Google as a catalyst for future development. --- PB
- Provide multiple access points. --- PB
- Evaluate Zoning to promote economic development. --- PC
- Connect to regional network. --- TC
- Provide dog parks or other opportunities along corridor. --- PB
- Balance functionality and a place people want to use – amenities, attractive place, no dead zones. -- TC
- Ensure access points for all strollers: Universal access. --- PB
- Increase housing and transit oriented develop in business districts. --- PC
- Sound Transit easement – future Corridor location – put on one side. --- PC

- Exploit connectivity to the maximum extent. *PC*
- Provide examples of other national corridor plans. e.g. the Highline in NYC. *PB*
- Develop regulations that require dedication of public access up front. --- *PC*
- Provide access connections to broader transportation system. City—Regionally. --- *TC*

As a member of a board or commission, what interests or issues should we be addressing with the Comprehensive Plan Update?

- Share information between the three groups (Transportation, Planning, Parks).
Action Idea: Have a board member be assigned to attend each others study sessions. -- *TC*
- Is there a template for what the GMA requirements are for each element?
Action Idea: Share this template with each Board and Commission -- *PB*
- Align Growth Projections to Housing, Job Density with Transportation and Parks Levels of Service.
Action Idea: Share Capacity Analysis with the Transportation Commission and Parks Board. -- *TC*
- Notify Boards Commissions of major land use trends so Transportation Commission is aware.
- Neighborhood Centers should receive focused evaluation. -- *TC*
- Density combined with good bike & pedestrian transportation. (Density + Transit + Ped connections + Parks). Juanita Villiage a good model.
- Will the Planning Commission be open to new strategies from the Transportation Commission? --- *TC*
- Boards & Commissions need to communicate to public about why changes are important.
- Comp Plan needs to be more accessible to the public and easy to access on-line.
- Communicate to public the interrelationships between the plans (land use policies, transit plans, capital projects).
- We should evaluate the fiscal impacts of proposed land use, transportation changes to the City.
- On the Cross-Kirkland Corridor should we evaluate the potential for high capacity transit now? How does the City stand on this issue?
- On the Cross Kirkland Corridor consider building the pedestrian/bicycle trail on the side to plan for future light rail.
- Neighborhood Plans:
 - Can be too specific
 - How do other cities do them?
 - Redo process
 - How do we prioritize which one is updated?

As a member of a board or commission, what interests or issues should we be addressing with the Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Plan?

- Develop existing open spaces as pocket parks
- Access to parks & provide adequate parking
- Parking at trail heads
- Geographic distribution of recreation amenities
- Capacity planning – long term
- Meeting Goals of Shoreline Master Program (soft shorelines)
- Increasing shoreline access – to & from
- Recreational concessions
- Maintain & promote Levels of Service across all neighborhoods
- Design Totem Lake Park as a Cross-Kirkland Corridor destination

As a member of a board or commission, what interests or issues should we be addressing with the Transportation Master Plan?

- Juanita Drive cannot handle an increase in traffic. Can we encourage use of Simonds Rd as an alternative route? Access to Big Finn Hill is challenging, particularly from Juanita Drive. --- *PB*
- Providing sufficient capacity for Kirkland 2035 housing needs and land use plan --- *PC*
- Totem Lake planning – will we be constrained from traffic capacity? --- *PC*
- Provide realistic alternatives to getting around – bike, ped. --- *PC*
- Require wider sidewalks to encourage pedestrian access. --- *PC*
- Totem Lake as urban center but is auto-oriented now. Needs to be focused on pedestrian & bike improvements as well. --- *TC*
- Bike lanes enhance auto traffic – make auto flow much better. --- *PC*
- Cross-Kirkland Corridor will provide complete thru-traffic (Ped-Bike) as alternative to streets. Fundamental building blocks. --- *PB*
- Prioritization of improvements of Cross-Kirkland Corridor --- *PC*
- Sound Transit is not appropriate for small towns. Too expensive for how many to use it. --- *PB*
- Cross-Kirkland Corridor use as a bus corridor rather than for Sound Transit, or light rail. --- *PC*
- Dedicated bus lanes in streets (regional). How do we get reliability, speed for bus use? --- *PC*
- Go with high frequency – key corridor - bus routes rather than low service to wider area. --- *PB; PC*
- Add density to key routes = productive routes. --- *PC*
- Don't need high volume bus near parks. Want to encourage walking & biking to parks. --- *PC*
- Parking at parks is sufficient. But should we use valuable park land for parking use? --- *PB*

- Like pay parking but difficult to sell --- *PC*
- Get rid of minimum parking requirements and put in maximum parking. Let the market drive parking.- *PC*
- Lack of available parking reflects a strong CBD economy. --- *TC*
- Mix use parking a good approach – Office/RM --- *PC*
- Park parking – talk about what you can do – get there by bike, etc.